

TH

AG

Re

FELLO

circum
action
say the
tant in
this sol
resting
the first
Lord J
will of
privileg
ance.
consider
and, the
quences
attitude
customs
the cost
Some th
prepared
the wat
the peop
from am

THE TEXT BOOK FOR THE CAMPAIGN.

AN APPEAL TO THE CHRISTIAN PUBLIC

AGAINST THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC,

AND IN BEHALF OF

THE DUNKIN ACT.

BY

Rev. W. A. McKAY, B. A., Baltimore, Ont.

FELLOW-CHRISTIANS,—

In the providence of God you are placed in very solemn circumstances. You will soon be called upon to take decided action for or against the Liquor Traffic in our midst. I venture to say that never have you exercised the franchise when more important interests were at stake. It will therefore be your desire on this solemn occasion to act according to the heavy responsibility resting upon you. "Lord, what wilt Thou have me to do?" was the first inquiry of the great Apostle on submitting himself to the Lord Jesus; and throughout his whole life of toils and trials the will of Christ never ceased to be his law. It is our duty and privilege to look to the same great source for direction and guidance. I purpose, therefore, to set before you in this paper some considerations that may help you to ascertain the mind of Christ, and, therefore, your duty on the subject before us. As to consequences to myself personally of my present action, and from the attitude I have always felt bound to take against the drinking customs of society, all I have to say is that years ago I counted the cost of so doing, and determined to fear God rather than man. Some things I have endured already, and, if God so wills it, I am prepared to endure more, but I cannot and dare not be silent. "If the watchman see the sword come, and blow not the trumpet, and the people be not warned; if the sword come and take any person from among them, he is taken away in his iniquity, *but his blood*

will I require at the watchman's hand." In view of this solemn warning, as a minister of the Gospel, "here I stand; I cannot do otherwise; so God help me."

I shall first lay before you some of the results of the Liquor Traffic, and then I shall consider the objections urged by the liquor dealers and their friends against the kind of legislation we are now seeking. Our antagonism to this traffic is not a mere sentiment or theory: it is based on unquestionable *facts*, many of them dark and dreadful enough. To a few of these I will now refer. Look first at

THE FINANCIAL EFFECT OF THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC.

While a Christian's conduct in a matter of moral right or wrong is never to be determined by the mere consideration of dollars and cents, yet, doubtless, in coming to a decision this is one element which, as a citizen and a Christian, he has a right not to overlook. Besides, our opponents are continually pressing this matter of finances upon us. How is the Government going to be supported, it is asked, if the Liquor Traffic is prohibited? To this we might reply, in the words of the great W. E. Gladstone, when he was Prime Minister of England. To a deputation of brewers who urged upon him the loss to the revenue by any step towards prohibition, he said: "Gentlemen, you need not give yourselves any trouble about the revenue. The question of revenue must never stand in the way of needed reform. Besides, with a sober population not wasting their earnings, I will know where to obtain the revenue." Lesser intellects than Gladstone's can understand that temperance will enrich a nation, whereas intemperance will as certainly impoverish and demoralize it. But, not to rest in a general statement, let us descend into particulars, and see the gain or loss to the country, financially, from this traffic. We will look at both sides of the account. On the credit side we put the amount annually received by the country for licenses, and for excise and import duties, amounting to the very large sum of \$5,000,000. This is all on that side. Now let us make up the debit side of the account. And first we put the salaries paid for collecting those licenses and duties—a very considerable sum. Then we have the amount paid for the prevention,

detection and punishment of crimes caused by strong drink. And in order to get some idea of this item, let any one take an average criminal case, and reckon the cost of it to the country. Let him reckon how much it will take to pay the judge, the Crown lawyer, the jurors, the constable, and the jailor, during the time they have been occupied with the case. Let him also bear in mind that, as we shall shortly prove, three-fourths of all the criminal cases in the country are owing to the Liquor Traffic, and then he will have some conception of the vastness of this single item. The best authorities make it at least two million dollars every year (\$2,000,000). Besides, a very large amount of the cost of our asylums must be charged against the Liquor Traffic, as it is capable of demonstration that a large proportion of maniacs and idiots is owing to it. But this is not all. We have to estimate the amount paid by the country in the form of charity for the support of paupers made by the traffic. We must put down also the value of the property annually destroyed by fires and accidents caused by drink. From returns made to queries sent to manufacturers, merchants, and contractors in Ontario, by a Select Committee of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario, we find that three-fifths of the accidents, and the destruction of property which annually occur, are traced by them to the use of intoxicating drinks, while most of the employers assert that they will not knowingly employ any but temperance men.

Then reckon up the enormous loss to the *industry* of the country from this traffic. For, be it remembered, the man who wastes his time in idleness inflicts a loss not only upon himself and family, but also upon the community at large. The country is so much poorer than it would be were that man industrious. Now, consider how great is the number of those idlers through drink. Within a mile of where I write, in a respectable rural district, I will not undertake to say how many—enough to sadden the heart—who thus waste, some of them the whole of their time, and most of them a considerable part of it, in tippling and drunkenness. Nor do I suppose that this district is worse than others, or even so bad as some. There is not a bar-room in Canada around which does not cluster a number of loafing do-nothings. It is computed that there are at least thirty thousand persons in this Dominion who

lose not less than thirty days in the year through drinking habits. If they could earn \$1.50 a day—and many of them could earn much more—then by their drinking the country loses \$1,350,000 a year in productive industry. Mark the amount, *one million three hundred and fifty thousand dollars!* An enormous sum, truly, but still far within the reality, for we shall, by-and-bye, see that the time of *every man engaged in this traffic* is just so much lost to the industry of the country.

Again, it has been frequently stated in our Legislative Assembly that every industrious able-bodied man that can be induced to come and settle amongst us is worth to the country at least \$1,500; but statistics prove that through strong drink upwards of 4,000 lives are sacrificed every year. The loss to the country in this respect is therefore \$6,000,000 a year (*six million dollars*). But this is not all. The largest item in the financial waste of the Liquor Traffic is yet to come. There are consumed in the distilleries and breweries of the Dominion annually about 2,750,000 bushels of grain. This would make 41,250,000 of four-pound loaves of bread. To form some idea of this enormous waste, observe that if these four-pound loaves were laid as paving stones they would pave a road 30 feet wide for 700 miles long. And yet we are crying out "Hard times!" and "Scarcity of food!" From a careful computation submitted to the House of Commons by G. W. Ross, M.P. for Middlesex West, it appears that every year the sum of \$25,000,000 is absorbed in the Liquor Traffic, or about an average of \$6 per head for every man, woman and child in the Dominion. Mr. Ross reckons that the financial loss to the country from this traffic is \$41,000,000, while the revenue derived is, as we have seen, only \$5,000,000. Here then we have both sides of the account, leaving a net loss to the country from the Liquor Traffic of \$36,000,000 (*thirty-six million dollars*). Now, I ask, is it wise financially to sanction a traffic that is every year costing the country such an enormous sum? This is surely penny wise and pound foolish. As a member of Parliament expressed it: "Is it not absurd that we must spend such an enormous amount as *forty-one million dollars* in order to raise the comparatively small amount of five million dollars of revenue?" There was a nobleman in Great Britain who died a few years ago, who was very particular in looking after little

th
da
th
an
he
tra
Th
wh
are
tha
rev
for
irre
our
brok
of v
Chri
peri
it rig
occa
miss
the
labou
deaf
annu
men,
throu
tinue
But
measu
cial lo
of pri
Health
State
treasu
and Cl
of the
Look a

things, and was penurious in regard to small sums of money. One day in driving he accidentally dropped a shilling down the slit of the carriage window; he at once drove round to his coach-maker and asked that the shilling be taken out for him. A few days after he received from the coach-maker a bill to this effect: "To extracting coin from the slit of the carriage window, five shillings." That was, you say, a poor financial transaction. But that is just what, as a people, we are doing in sanctioning the Liquor Traffic. We are paying five shillings in order to get one shilling. Nay, worse than that, we are paying *forty-one millions* in order to raise a revenue of *five millions*. And what return does the traffic yield us for this vast outlay? You see the return in the indolence, irreligion, profanity, quarrels, fights, murders, suicides, with which our daily papers are almost constantly filled. You have it in the broken hearts, impoverished homes, diseased bodies and lost souls of which perhaps the world never hears. I put it to you, my Christian reader, is this right? At a time when thousands are perishing for bread, and tens of thousands for lack of knowledge, is it right directly or indirectly to countenance a traffic that is the occasion of such a frightful waste of food and money? Our missionary schemes are languishing for lack of funds. The cry of the heathen is sounded in our ears, "Come over and help us;" labourers are saying, "Here am I, send me;" but we must turn a deaf ear to both for lack of money; and yet we are spending annually in that which is ruining the bodies and souls of our fellow-men, *two hundred times* as much as is raised for sending the gospel throughout the world. Is this right? How long shall this continue?

But the great question before us rises infinitely above the measurement of dollars and cents. Even if there were no financial loss connected with the Liquor Traffic, though it were a source of princely revenue, the State could ill afford to encourage it. Health, happiness and good morals are of more importance to the State than even gold. Let those be wanting, and though the State treasury should constantly overflow with money, the true patriot and Christian may well repeat with anxious heart the dying words of the Prince of Orange: "God have mercy on my poor country!" Look at

THE PHYSICAL EFFECTS OF STRONG DRINK.

Here indeed the "sin reigns unto death." The Committee to which I have already referred, in its report to the House of Commons, says : "Intoxicating drinks produce disease in every form, stunted growth in the young, premature decay and death, apoplexy, paralysis, idiocy, madness, suicide and violent death, by which more lives are wasted in a single year than by all the great battles of the last century."

Liquor dealers tell us that strong drink imparts strength and power of endurance, but their testimony, I beg to say, is not that of skilful, nor yet of disinterested witnesses. As opposed to them, I will call before you a cloud of witnesses whose testimony cannot be gainsayed. We will hear what the most noted physicians and chemists in the world have to say on this matter. Their education and experience pre-eminently qualify them to give a sound judgment ; and their testimony is not merely *disinterested*, but *contrary to their own pecuniary interests* : for, with perhaps the exception of lawyers, no class would lose so much pecuniarily by the suppression of the Liquor Traffic as physicians. All honour then to those men who, rising above low and selfish considerations, have united almost as with one voice in testifying against strong drink and in favour of total abstinence. Let us look at *medical testimony against alcoholic drinks*.

A large body of physicians, composed of several hundreds of the most eminent of the profession from England, Scotland and Ireland, gave testimony before a Committee of the British Parliament, and unitedly declared that—

"Intoxicating drinks are *never* necessary to men in health, but, on the contrary, are *always* hurtful ; that they are in fact poisonous, like opium, arsenic, nux vomica, prussic acid, and other substances which God has given to be used in small quantities for medical purposes, and which, if so used, may be productive of wholesome results, but which it would be preposterous to think of using as a beverage."

Nearly two thousand physicians and surgeons of Great Britain, including the physicians to the Queen, the heads of the Army and Navy Medical Departments, and many of the most distinguished medical authorities and writers of the day, have united in the following declaration :—

"I. That a very large portion of human misery, including poverty, disease and crime, is induced by the use of alcoholic or fermented liquors as beverages. II. That the most perfect health is compatible with total abstinence from all such intoxicating beverages, whether in the form of ardent spirits, or as wine, beer, ale, porter, cider, &c. III. That persons accustomed to such drinks may, with perfect safety, discontinue them entirely, either at once or gradually, after a short time. IV. That total and universal abstinence from alcoholic liquors, and intoxicating beverages of all sorts, would greatly contribute to the health, the prosperity, the morality, and the happiness of the human race."

Few names stand higher in medical science or are better known than that of Sir Astley Cooper, and this is what he says:—

"No man can have a greater hostility to dram-drinking than myself, inasmuch that I never suffer any ardent spirits in my house, thinking them evil spirits. And if the poor could witness the white livers, the dropsies, the shattered nervous systems which I have seen, as the consequences of drinking, they would be aware that spirits and poisons are synonymous terms."

Dr. T. K. Chambers, Physician to the Prince of Wales, says:—

"It is clear that we must cease to regard alcohol as in any sense an aliment (a food), inasmuch as it goes out (of the body) as it goes in."

Dr. Lees says:—

"There is more real nourishment in a threepenny brown loaf than is to be found in a barrel of Allsopp's ale, containing three hundred and sixty-five gallons, and costing \$175!"

Liebig says:—

"We can prove, with mathematical certainty (as plain as two and two make four), that as much flour or meal as can lie on the point of a table-knife is more nutritious than nine quarts of the best Bavarian beer."

Dr. Rae, who made two or three Polar Expeditions, and whose powers of endurance were put to as severe a test as man's ever were, gives clear and emphatic testimony. "Brandy," he says, "stimulates but for a few minutes, and greatly lessens a man's power to endure cold."

A few weeks ago a Conference of eminent medical men met in London, Eng. Dr. Acland presided. A paper was read by Dr. B. W. Richardson, and the meeting was addressed by Professor Rolleston, Dr. Lewis, Dr. Wark, Mr. Sankey (medical superintendent of the Oxford Lunatic Asylum), and others. The *Lancet*, the great medical journal of Britain, gives a report of the Conference, and describes Dr. Richardson "one who has studied alcohols in all its forms,

more perhaps than any physiologist or physician living." Here is the testimony Dr. Richardson gives :—

"In its action on the living body alcohol deranges the constitution of the blood, unduly excites the heart and respiration, paralyzes the minute blood-vessels, increases and decreases, according to the degree of its application, the functions of its digestive organs, of the liver, and of the kidneys, disturbs the regularity of nervous action, lowers the animal temperature, and lessens the muscular power."

This is the matured judgment of "one who has studied the subject more perhaps than any physiologist or physician living." The *Lancet*, commenting on this testimony, says :—"Let there be no mistake about the voice of medical practitioners or authorities on this matter. *It is on the side of temperance—of extreme temperance.*"

Our own Canadian physicians are equally emphatic in testifying to the physical evils of intemperance. An examination of 88 papers returned from coroners to the Parliamentary Committee, shows that six-tenths of all the cases of deaths needing inquests have been from intemperance.

Dr. Daniel Clark, medical superintendent of the Lunatic Asylum, Toronto, says :—

"On an average, at least one-half of deaths needing inquests have been from intemperance." And he adds, "There is no radical remedy for the evil but total prohibition."

Dr. Dickson, the well-known superintendent of Rockwood Asylum at Kingston, gave the following clear testimony to the Committee :—

"Intoxicating liquors used as a beverage not only predispose to mental and physical disease, but actually produce more mental and physical suffering and disease than all other known noxious substances combined."

An able writer in a late number of one of our leading periodicals says :—"Looking at facts as they stand—facts which cannot be ignored—the term 'LICENSED POISONER' might be applied far more appropriately than the strange misnomer 'LICENSED VICTUALLER,' to those whose business it is to sell, not the food which nourishes and invigorates, but the alcoholic poison which, used at it is used, debilitates and destroys, not the physical frame alone, but the mental and moral being of its thousands of victims." Every bar-room in our land, and thousands of wretched homes, furnish

abu
to t
wor
tran
som
legi
dica
of e
Chr
drum
even
and
ing
thirs
not i
bran
frien
dislo

Bu
are, a

I k
of th
fails
beer-c
becau
drink
power
to look
indulg
duces
injure
ishing
If we
find th
minds
Frankl

abundant illustration and confirmation of the foregoing testimonies to the physical effects of intoxicating drinks. Human bodies so wonderfully made, created to be temples of the Holy Ghost, are transformed through drink into dens of uncleanness—bloated, loathsome forms, seething masses of corruption. This is the natural and legitimate result of the Liquor Traffic. And does not this clearly indicate Divine disapproval of the traffic, and consequently the duty of every Christian to oppose it by all honourable means in his power? Christian reader, call up before your mind's eye the four thousand drunkards (to say nothing of others who drink to excess) who die every year in our Dominion; see them scarred, defaced, disfigured and diseased by strong drink; look at the bloodshot eye, the burning skin, the horrid breath, the bloated form, the unquenchable thirst, the staggering pace, the delirium, the death, and I ask is there not in all this a voice loud and distinct as the thunder of Niagara, branding the traffic with the curse of God, and calling upon the friends of humanity and of God to unite promptly and earnestly to dislodge this monster scourge from his dwelling among us?

But the financial and physical effects of this traffic, fearful as they are, are not the worst.

IT BLIGHTS THE INTELLECT.

I know our opponents deny this. The clever agent and advocate of the distillers and tavern-keepers of Ontario, I am told, never fails to tell his hearers that the "greatest nations in the world are beer-drinkers." If that is true, I observe that their greatness is not because of their drinking, but in spite of it. It is not true that drinking men are all men of talent, or that their intellects acquire power as their drinking increases. On the contrary, one has only to look around him to see abundant proof of the fact that constant indulgence in intoxicating liquors debauches the intellect and produces a sort of mental imbecility or derangement. Whatever injures the physical system, impairing the bodily health and diminishing the vital force, necessarily weakens the intellectual powers. If we look over the biography of the great in other ages, we shall find that those who have possessed the clearest and most profound minds were total abstainers. Sir Isaac Newton, John Locke, Dr. Franklin, John Wesley, Sir William Jones, John Fletcher, and

President Edwards furnish striking illustrations of this truth. One of the secrets by which these men produced such astonishing results, and were able to perform so much intellectual labour, and of so high a grade, and to arrive at old age in the enjoyment of health, was a rigid course of abstinence. The fact that some drunkards are men of intellect does not prove that they owe their talents to their drinking habits, but only that men of superior intellects and large hearts, genial natures and wide sympathies, are in great danger of becoming victims to this curse. There is no intellect so great but it will blight and degrade. Were it not for blush of shame, I could instance sad cases in illustration among some of the brightest lights of our land. I could tell of eminent physicians, lawyers, judges, and even ministers of religion, who have become enslaved and who, from the highest positions in their respective professions, have sunk to the level of ordinary bar-room loafers. And can anything be more unspeakably painful than this brutal degradation of God-like intellect? To see a man who was created in the image of God, and to whom an eternity of happiness with God is offered, degrading himself so that he acts like a wild beast or fiend, going through the street brandishing his fist, blaspheming God, a howling, defying, shouting, reeling, raving maniac;—ah! this is a sight, were it not so common, that might move to tears every heart not made of flint. An enemy does this. That enemy is the Liquor Traffic.

INTEMPERANCE WORKS DEATH ON A MAN'S MORAL POWERS.

Here the havoc is awful. Let the habit of indulging in strong drink once be formed, and what a change is produced sometimes in a few months! All the finer feelings of the soul are soon destroyed, the tenderest emotions and kindest sentiments are obliterated or petrified. The nature becomes hard, the heart becomes callous, the conscience seared, and every good motive loses its power. Gradually but surely the man becomes impatient, peevish, ill-natured. And thus the demoralizing change goes on until not unfrequently the once tender husband and kind father becomes a very fiend of rage and cruelty. The lips that once spoke only of love now belch forth the foulest language of hell, and the poor little children fly at the father's approach as they would from a devouring monster. Oh!

the domestic sorrows and desolations caused by drink! No language can describe the miseries of a drunkard's wife or the wretchedness of a drunkard's home. Recall to mind such recent illustrations as the murder of Mrs. Smith by her husband in Sarnia; the murder of Greig by his own son under circumstances of peculiar horror, the son kicking the corpse of his father; or the murder of Mrs. Ryan by her husband in Peterboro'. I cannot forget how Ryan's little girl, only ten years of age, said at her father's trial, "Pa was always kind to ma and me when he didn't drink." These artless words tell us the powers of this demon of Drink, and they might be applied to hundreds and thousands of cases in our land. The Warden of a prison writes: "Since I have been connected with the prison, we have had twenty-one here for killing their wives, two for killing their fathers, and one for killing his mother. Of these twenty-four, all but one were not only habitual drunkards, but actually drunk when they committed the crime. . . . These were not bad men except when they were under the influence of liquor." No language can depict the woe that is poured into the hearts and homes of our people by this traffic. It is enough to make one weep tears of blood to think of it. And will the Church of God look on with indifference, or refuse to engage heartily in a movement that contemplates the removal of the cause of this demoralization and woe?

Looking beyond the family, we see

THE EFFECTS OF THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC ON SOCIETY.

It is well known that for some years past crimes of a serious character have been alarmingly on the increase. We have been experiencing what is truly called "an epidemic of crime." Look at the contents of the daily papers. What dark deeds, what wilful destruction of property, what robberies, what incendiaries, what licentiousness, what irreligion, what Sabbath desecration, what heaven-daring crimes, what cruelties, what suicides, what murders! Three-fourths of all this we charge directly on the Liquor Traffic; and we shall subpoena witnesses who will on this point testify to what they know, and bear witness to what they have seen. And first we have—

ENGLISH JUDGES ON LIQUOR AND CRIME.

The following is the testimony of some of the ablest judges of the English Courts:

Judge Coleridge :—"There is scarcely a crime that comes before me that is not, directly or indirectly, caused by strong drink."

Judge Patteson :—"If it were not for this drinking, you (the jury) and I would have nothing to do."

Judge Williams :—"Experience has proved that almost all crime into which juries have had to inquire may be traced in one way or another to drunkenness."

Judge Wightman :—"I find in every calendar that comes before me, one unfailing source, directly or indirectly, of most of the crimes that are committed—intemperance."

Judge Alderson :—"If all men could be dissuaded from the use of intoxicating liquors, the office of a judge would be a sinecure."

Lord Shaftesbury says:—"Seven-tenths of the moral evil of London are attributable to that which is the greatest curse of the country—habits of drinking and the system of intoxication."

The Inspector of Prisons in Belgium says:—"My experience extends over a quarter of a century, and I can emphatically declare that four-fifths of the crime and misery with which, in my public and private capacity, I have come in contact, has been the result of drink."

The late **Dr. Guthrie** says:—"Before God and man, before the Church and the world, I impeach intemperance; I charge it with the murder of innumerable souls; I charge it as the cause of almost all the poverty, and almost all the crime, and almost all the misery, and almost all the ignorance, and almost all the irreligion that disgrace and afflict the land."

Coming to our own country, we find testimony against the Liquor Traffic equally explicit and emphatic. The returns to the queries of the Select Parliamentary Committee from Judges, Police Magistrates, Justices of the Peace and Sheriffs in Ontario, agree in ascribing "more than three-fourths of the crime of the Province to intoxicating drink."

Roland Burr, Esq., Justice of the Peace in Toronto, and Gaol Commissioner for nearly twenty years, in a statement before our Legislature, says that nine out of ten of the male prisoners, and nineteen out of twenty of the female, have been brought there by intoxicating liquors. He examined nearly 2,000 prisoners in the gaols throughout Ontario, two-thirds of whom were males, and nearly all signed a petition for Prohibition, many of them stating that their only hope of being saved from ruin was to go where intoxicating liquors could not be sold. In four years there were 25,000 prisoners in our gaols, 22,000 of whom were brought there by strong drink.

The **Recorder of Montreal** has set down the proportion of criminal cases before that court, due to intemperance, as nine-tenths.

The arrests in Ottawa for three years were 2,282, and of these 1,843 were owing to strong drink.

The arrests in Toronto during the same time were 15,000, and of these 8,000 were owing to strong drink.

During the same time there were confined in Cobourg gaol 446, and of this number no less than 371 were intemperate.

The **Chief of Police in St. John, N. B.**, declares:—

“Nearly all the crimes brought under my notice, officially, are attributable either directly or indirectly to the use of intoxicating liquors as a beverage. From the experience of a life-time of which eleven years I have been Chief of Police, I am satisfied that nothing short of a Prohibitory Liquor Law will check this monstrous evil with which we are surrounded.”

Attorney-General Mowat, in his place in our Legislature, speaking of intemperance, said:—

“An enormous proportion, probably three-fourths, of the vice which prevailed at the present day, of the crime which they had to contend with, of the lunacy, the idiocy, the poverty, and the misery of every kind, was owing to the foul evil of intemperance. When from one frightful cause such enormous evils resulted, it was no wonder that the humane, the benevolent, and the Christian were excited in their endeavour to provide some remedy.”

I will add only one other testimony, and I give it as a sample of thousands that might be furnished. It ought to have weight; it is

a cry from the portals of eternity. And if it is a solemn warning from danger, it is no less a solemn call to God's people to come to the rescue of the perishing.

The dying speech of the murderer Humphrey, executed in Windsor last month, was as follows :—

"My dear friends—I am now on the scaffold to pay the last penalty of the law, and I bless God that He has seen fit to pardon me and wash away my sins. I feel that my sentence is just, and I want to warn you all, my dear friends, never, never to touch the intoxicating cup. **IT WAS ALL THROUGH LIQUOR THAT I CAME HERE.** Oh! my friends, as you value your own souls, leave that cup alone. It has done more harm than all other things put together, and has been the ruin of thousands as it has been of me. May God have mercy upon me and give me grace!"

Christian reader, reflect that the blighting effects of this traffic are not confined to time; they extend into eternity. One might well think that the abounding pauperism, the physical suffering and mental degradation, the immorality, the ruined and wretched homes, the domestic brutality, the brawls, the suicides, the murders caused by intemperance would present a picture sufficiently dismal to move to a better mind the most selfish opponent of Prohibition. But there is more yet, and worse yet—

THE LOSS OF THE SOUL.

No drunkard shall inherit the kingdom of God (1 Cor. vi. 10).

Christian, think what the loss of a soul implies. Oh! there is an eternity of meaning in it that no pen can describe or human mind conceive. Try to form some conception of a lost soul, and then bear in mind that there are in England alone not fewer than 600,000 habitual drunkards. "Of these 60,000 die every year, and their places are supplied by 60,000 others drawn into the vortex of ruin, from what many regard as the safe and happy stream of moderation. So that every ten minutes some fresh victim becomes a drunkard—every ten minutes some drunkard's soul is hurried to a drunkard's eternity!" In the United States there are about the same number of drunkards and of deaths therefrom. "If," says an

American writer, "all the victims of the rum traffic were gathered before our eyes, we should see a thousand funerals a week from their number. Placed in a procession, five abreast, the drunkards of America would form an army *one hundred miles long*, with a suicide occurring in every mile." And in our own fair Dominion see our great army of inebriates, at least 30,000 strong, marching on to sure and swift destruction, more than 4,000 of them annually passing away into a drunkard's awful eternity. How overwhelmingly appalling is such a fact! How loudly does it call on Christians to come to the rescue! But this is not all. This traffic ruins the souls of multitudes who cannot justly be called drunkards. The constant habit of tipping in bar-rooms cannot fail gradually to harden the heart, so that the most tender appeal or the most solemn warning falls upon it like the rain upon the rock; and thus in the end the ruin of the soul is as effectually accomplished as by drunkenness itself. Seriousness, purity, piety, cannot live long amid the blasphemy and ribaldry, the lewd jokes and filthy conversation of a modern bar-room. The Rev. Dr. Zabriskie, of N. York, says; "Of all those who, during the awakenings which have taken place during my ministry, have expressed an interest, and even in some cases an anxiety, for their own salvation, scarcely a single individual of any, who, to my knowledge was a frequenter of liquor saloons, either as dealer or drinker, arrived at the saving knowledge of the truth." A man cannot drink of the cup of the Lord and of the cup of devils. Let the reader look round him, say on the congregation with which he himself is connected, and see how *drinking* as well as drunkenness hardens the heart against every spiritual influence, and, as far, at least, as man can see, destroys the souls of those who once gave good hope of an interest in Christ. Thousands of communicants who are now a laughing-stock to the world, a stumbling-block to weak believers and to the young, a heartsore to ministers and others, and a disgrace to religion, would, if the temptation of drink were removed, be worthy, useful and exemplary members. Then think also how in many cases this curse renders almost hopeless the salvation of the drunkard's children. Think of the malignant influences under which the dispositions and habits of those children are formed. Reflect that, not unfrequently, the mother contracts the evil habit from the father; and thus both

parents unite in the unnatural and monstrous employment of ruining their own children. What a sad scene! A husband and wife, to whom God has given children, to be trained up by them for heaven, united together in taking them by the hand, and leading them coolly down to perdition! And yet such scenes exist in the neighbourhood of every tavern, and there are hundreds of them in these counties. Innocent, helpless children, perfectly unconscious of their danger, led by father and mother, as victims to the altar of a modern Moloch, not less cruel than the heathen god, before whom Israelitish parents burnt their offspring.

It were easy to show, did space permit us, how the Liquor Traffic hinders the work of Home and Foreign Missions, and indeed every department of the Church's work. The Church and the bar-room are opposition places, the abodes respectively of God and Satan. The more the bar-room prospers the less will the church prosper, and the more the church prospers the less will the bar-room prosper. The struggle between them is, as Mr. Charles Paxton, M. P., says, "One development of the war between heaven and hell."

But it will perhaps be said that all this is the result, not of drinking, but of drunkenness, and ought not therefore to be charged against the Liquor Traffic. My reply is that such is the nature of strong drink, and such the nature of the human constitution, that where there is drinking there will always be drunkenness, with all its terrible consequences. We hold, therefore, the traffic responsible for drunkenness and all its legitimate results. They both go together. Together they live, and together they will die. Like Siamese twins, they are inseparably connected, and the one dying the other will die with it. Do away with the Liquor Traffic and you do away with drunkenness. O, that God would give His people grace to understand the enormity of this great evil, and strength and faithfulness in dealing with it!

I now proceed to consider the particular mode of legislation on the Liquor Traffic we are at present seeking. It is called the "Temperance Act of 1864," but is better known as the Dunkin Act; and by this designation I shall, for the sake of brevity, speak of it. This Act, if it should become law, will extend from Bowmanville on the west to Trenton on the east, including the two counties of

Northumberland and Durham—an area of about 1,500 square miles, and containing about 100,000 souls. But there never was a law on the Statute Books of any country against which objections would not be urged by those whose interests were injuriously affected, or supposed to be so; and the present law forms no exception.

THE OBJECTIONS BROUGHT AGAINST THE DUNKIN ACT

by the liquor sellers and their friends are not a few. Let us look at them, and we will state them as far as possible in the very words of our opponents.

1. *"The law you propose is a tyrannical one; it interferes with personal liberty. This is a free country, and I have a right to sell or drink what I please, and you have no right to dictate to me."* Our country is indeed free, but not for any one to do whatever he pleases without regard to the interests of others. Our country is not free to sell lottery-tickets, indecent pictures, or grossly immoral publications. It is not free for counterfeiting coin, or opening houses avowedly of infamy, or gambling establishments. The law prohibits the sale of tainted meat and of adulterated food. And why these prohibitions? Just because although some persons, for the sake of gain, would be quite ready to engage in these evil practices, society has decided that such practices are not for the good but for the hurt of the community. And no good citizen calls these prohibitions tyrannical, or an undue interference with personal liberty. But the Liquor Traffic, as we have seen, works far more injury to society than any or all of these practices together. Where then is the tyranny in prohibiting it? If it is not inconsistent with the liberty of a free country to prohibit the sale of unwholesome meat, by what process of reasoning do our opponents show that it is inconsistent with that liberty to prohibit the sale of unwholesome drink?

We live not in a savage but in a civilized community, and in such a state every man's liberty is limited by the good of society. The tavern-keeper has no right to interfere with the rights of others. Wives have rights; children have rights: quiet, peaceable members of society, who wish to live in security of life and property, have rights, and these rights must be preserved even at the ex-

pense of denying to some others the right to sell whiskey and get drunk. I will illustrate. A short time ago four young men, while under the influence of liquor, entered the house of a man named Garrett, near Kingston, and began abusing himself, his wife and children. Garrett is described as having been a quiet, inoffensive man. In endeavouring to protect his family against the insults of these drunken men he was killed, leaving a wife and seven children, the youngest an infant, to be supported by the State. Similar cases occur almost daily. They are the legitimate fruit of the Liquor Traffic. Now, what I would ask the opponents of Prohibition is this—have wives and children and respectable members of society no right to claim protection from such murderous assaults as the above? Or again, have the ratepayers, who must bear all the expenses connected with the arrest, incarceration, trial and punishment of these four men, and the support of the widow and seven helpless children, no rights? Must they tamely pay their money, fold their hands, and say nothing? No, my friends. Prohibition says that when a business doubles the taxes and renders life and property insecure, society has a right to say whether or not that business is to be tolerated. The fact is, this Liquor Traffic has been so pampered and petted that it has “waxed fat,” and kicks at all restrictions. It fills our land with idleness, irreligion, immorality, violence and crime, and then, looking up from its banquet of broken hearts and ruined hopes and fallen characters, it tells us with brazen face that we have no right to interfere. But it won't do. The time is coming when this accursed traffic will be prohibited like any other nuisance or crime.

2. *“But the passing of this Act will depreciate the value of tavern property.”* This is the cry of Demetrius of old: “Sirs, ye know that by this craft we have our wealth. . . . our craft is in danger.” (Acts xix. 24-27.) But notwithstanding the money-loss to Demetrius and his fellow-artizans, the cause of Truth went forward. And so it must be now. These men must remember that there can be no change in the legislation of a country, or in the customs or opinions of a people, without affecting more or less injuriously for a time the interests of some persons. But no one ever heard of compensation being given in these cases. In the words of the leading paper of our Dominion: “Changes in fashion and national

customs often lay certain industries desolate, and divert commerce into entirely different channels, to the great suffering and loss of multitudes. In such changes there may be great hardship and undeniable destruction of property; but the thing can not be helped, and compensation is never thought of. The spinning jenny ruined thousands of hand-loom weavers, and railways have shut up many a turnpike tavern, without remedy and without compensation. So can it be with intoxicating liquors, and those engaged in their manufacture or sale." If, through the advocacy of Temperance principles, any man would succeed in persuading the community to abstain from drinking, the tavern-keeper might as consistently as at present say to that man: "You have depreciated the value of my property; I want compensation." But certainly no compensation would be thought of.

We are constantly being told that Britain paid twenty million pounds sterling for the abolition of slavery. But the cases are not at all parallel. The money was paid to the slave-owner to compensate him for property that was actually taken from him, but he received nothing for the loss of a hitherto lawful and remunerative business. But the passing of this Act in these countries, at the present time, would deprive the liquor seller of no property. Their buildings will still, as much as ever, be their own; and after the passing of the Act they will have eight or nine months to get out of the old business, and to adapt themselves to their new circumstances. Nor has Prohibition been suddenly or abruptly sprung upon these men. For forty years public opinion has been gradually acquiring strength against their traffic. Almost every year additional restrictions have been laid upon it. The present Act has been on the Statute Book for thirteen years. The dealers have been constantly reminded that the days of their traffic were numbered. But at all this they affected to sneer, and, with a full knowledge of all the circumstances, they invested their money in the business, simply because of the enormous profits connected with it. These are far more than those of any other business in the world, being reckoned not at ten, twenty, or even fifty per cent., but at several hundred per cent. And to-day these men are building new taverns; banding together, publishing newspapers, collecting enormous sums of money; hiring

agents and lecturers, and keeping at work a complete machinery, all, as they say themselves, "To oppose the agitation of the Temperance organizations;" and then they coolly turn round and say to these Temperance people: "Give us back our money; pay us for our Taverns, Breweries and Distilleries." Gentlemen, as you have made your bed you must lie in it. Besides, if there is to be compensation, let it be mutual. We, too, want to get something back—something far more precious than money. As Dr. Guthrie so pathetically puts it:—

"Give that mother back her son, as he was on the day when he returned from his father's grave, and in all the affection of his uncorrupted boyhood, walked to the house of God with a widowed, weeping mother leaning on his arm. Give that grieved man back his brother, as innocent and happy as in those days when the boys, twined in each other's arms, returned from school, bent over the same Bible, slept in the same bed, and never thought that the day would come when brother would blush for brother. Give this weeping wife who sits before us, wringing her hands in agony, the tears dropping through her jewelled fingers, and the lines of sorrow prematurely drawn on her beautiful brow—give her back the man she loved, such as he was when her young heart was won, when they stood side by side on the nuptial day, and receiving her from a fond father's hands, promised his love to one whose heart he has broken, and whose once graceful form now bends in sorrow to the ground. Give me back, as a man, the friends of my youthful days, whose wrecks now lie thick on this wreck-strewn shore. Give me back, as a minister, the brethren whom I have seen dragged from the pulpits they adorned and driven from the sweet manse where we have closed in the happy evening with praise and prayer, to stand, pale and haggard, at a public bar. Give me back, as a pastor, the lambs I have lost; give me her who, in the days of unsullied innocence, waited on our ministry, and whose unblushing forehead we now shrink to see, as she prowls through the street for her prey. Give me back the life of this youth who died the drunkard's death and dreed his doom, and who now, while his mother, by the body, rocks on the chair in speechless agony, lies laid out in a chamber where we dare not speak of comfort, but are left to weep with those that weep, dumb, not opening the mouth. Relieve us of the fears that lie heavy on our hearts for the character and the souls of some who hold parley with the devil by this forbidden tree, and are floating on the outer edge of that great gulf stream which sweeps its victims onwards to most woeful ruin."

Do this, and then talk of money.

3. *"The Liquor Traffic gives employment to a large number of persons, and thus benefits the industry of the country. But this Act will deprive them of that employment, and thus diminish the industry."*

A little examination will show that this argument is fallacious. There is no principle more clearly taught by political economy than that "every man who is not producing valuable goods, or adding by his labour to the wealth of the community in some form, is a burden on society. A standing army, navy, police, paupers, criminals, are of this class. They are consumers merely, to be provided for out of the labours of others." Now, to the class of consumers belong all those engaged in the Liquor Traffic. They live upon the industry and lives of others, and they add to the wealth of the community only as the spider adds to the prosperity of a group of flies. Could the liquor business be abolished for ever, and all engaged in it thrown on society for support, the State would be no worse off than it is now. These persons would be all consumers and non-producers then, as they are now. Hence, instead of it being an argument in favour of the Liquor Traffic that it employs so many persons, it is a strong argument against it. The more persons it employs, the greater is the loss to the country, because it keeps in the class of consumers those who ought to be producers.

4. *"But is it not cruel to deprive respectable men of their business?"* That there are some respectable men engaged in this business I do not feel disposed to deny; but that the business itself is respectable I do most emphatically deny. It is a soul-destroying, God-dishonouring business, as it is at present carried on. We are trying to make it respectable; and I verily believe that, if we succeed, these very men will, in the course of a few years, feel grateful to us for the change. They will still have a business which, if not so profitable as the present, will be more honourable, respectable and safe. They will have the satisfaction of knowing that they and their families are living upon money honourably obtained, and not upon the price of broken hearts and desolate homes. The business is a ruinous one to those engaged in it. "I have lately," says Rev. Dr. Taylor, of New York, "gone over in my mind the histories of all the spirit-dealers who were in a provincial town in Scotland of about 20,000 inhabitants, some ten years ago, and, so far as I can remember them, there are only three or four of the whole number who have not, themselves or their wives, or their sons or their daughters, fallen under the curse of strong drink."

Roland Burr, Esq., J.P., has kept a record of the liquor dealers of a ~~single~~ street in Toronto—100 in number—for 54 years past. In these families there have been 214 drunkards, 45 widows, and 235 orphans left, 44 sudden deaths, 13 suicides, 203 premature deaths by drunkenness, 4 murders, 3 executions, 1,915 years of human life estimated to have been lost by drunkenness, and a loss of property once owned in real estate amounting to \$293,500. Is it unkindness to relieve these men, even against their own will, of a business that is thus destroying themselves as well as others?

5. "*This Bill becoming law would depreciate the price of barley, and so injure the farmer.*" This, I am told, is the main argument employed by the agent of the liquor dealers when addressing farmers. It appeals to gross self-interest, and will therefore have weight only with those unfortunate beings who can look no higher. But the followers of Christ—and it is such I address—are not to decide duty on a great moral question like this by a consideration of mere dollars and cents. That man's religion is not worth much who, for the sake of pocketing a few more dollars, refuses to oppose a traffic that is doing more to hinder Christianity and to ruin souls than any other cause. But the argument is NOT TRUE. The passing of the By-law will *not be a loss but a great gain* to the farmer, as well as to every other branch of honest industry. Here, as in other things, it can be shown that real self-interest, intelligently understood, is always compatible with what is right before God. Bear in mind that the money now spent in drink would, were the Liquor Traffic prohibited, be used in supplying families that are now destitute and perishing, with the necessities and comforts of life. It would be invested in buying flour, grain, vegetables, fruit, &c.

The following calculation, taken from the "Canadian Temperance Almanac," to which I am indebted for a number of the facts embodied in this paper, will show how the farmer would be benefited by Prohibition:—

Suppose an individual to consume the very moderate quantity of one pint of beer per day; in the year it amounts at 5c. per pint, to \$18 25. With this amount of money, at different times in the course of the year, the teetotaler might purchase:

50 lbs. of meat.....	\$3 50
100 lbs. of flour.....	3 00
15 lbs. of butter.....	3 00
10 bush. of potatoes.....	2 50
1 bbl. of apples.....	1 50
Sundry farm and garden produce.....	5 00

\$18 50

When this sum is expended for beer, how stands the profit to the farmer?

To make 365 pints of beer, about five bushels of barley, are required; this is purchased of the farmer for \$3 50, and that is all he receives of the money. The remaining \$14 75 goes to pay duty, licenses, and the brewers, distillers, and wholesale and retail dealers.

Under the teetotal system the farmer receives.....\$18 25

Under the drinking system..... 3 50

Leaving a balance of.....\$14 75
in favour of agriculture by carrying out universal sobriety.

6. *It will increase taxation, by depriving the Counties of the revenue at present received for licenses."*

This objection, like the last, is addressed to self-interest, and is equally fallacious. Let us see exactly how the matter stands. In the Counties of Northumberland and Durham there are upwards of 800,000 acres of land. These Counties receive from tavern licenses about \$4,000, not including the towns of Cobourg and Port Hope, with which at present we have nothing to do. Supposing, then, that the licenses were abolished, and all the money at present received from that source raised by direct taxation, it would average a tax of ONLY 50 CENTS ON EVERY HUNDRED-ACRE FARM in the Counties. Let this fact be clearly understood. I say a tax of 50 cents on every farm of 100 acres would raise the amount at present received by these Counties for licenses.

But even this small amount would not require to be so raised. If the large number of men now dissipated and idle through drink were made sober, they would acquire means, and thus increase the taxable property, and so *decrease* taxation.

Besides, there is scarcely a class in the community that does not suffer loss to a far greater extent than 50 cents a year through drunken men being unable to pay their debts. The sober man has to pay more on the goods he buys, in order to make up to the seller

these losses. Let these considerations be taken along with the loss to the revenue pointed out in the beginning of this paper, and any intelligent man can decide, without difficulty, whether our Counties are enriched or the reverse by the Liquor Traffic.

7. "*The Dunkin Act cannot be enforced. It has proved a failure wherever tried.*" Who say so? Not the friends of Prohibition, but its opponents. And may not the wish be father to the thought?

"No man e'er felt the halter draw,
With good opinion of the law."

The fact is, if this Act were more inefficient it would be less opposed by the liquor dealers. That the Bill is perfect, or anything approaching to it, no wise person will presume to say. Nor is this to be expected. Reformations like this do not spring, Minerva-like, at once into full-grown maturity. But that this Act can be enforced so as to lessen immensely—if not entirely abolish—drinking, we are prepared to show by an array of testimony which cannot easily be set aside. Prohibitory laws precisely similar in character to the Dunkin Act have been enforced in some of the States of the American Union for very many years, and carried out with as much success as any other law on the Statute Books. In a pamphlet entitled "*Prohibition does Prohibit,*" by J. N. Stearns, we are presented with testimony from the highest authorities of the land, such as Governors, United States Senators, Representatives in Congress, Clergymen, Attorneys-General, Judges of Supreme Courts, Secretaries of State, State Constables, Mayors of Cities, Chaplains of Prisons, Chiefs of Police, Editors, Internal Revenue, Prison and Poor-house statistics. The united testimony of all is that "there is not one-tenth the quantity of liquor sold and used in these States of what there was before the Prohibitory Liquor Law came into force."

Judge Davis, of the Supreme Court of Maine, says: "No observing man who has lived in this State for 20 years, and has had an opportunity to know the facts, can doubt that the Maine Law has produced a hundred times more visible improvement in the character, condition, and prosperity of our people than any other law that was ever enacted."

Prohibition has been in force in Maine for 26 years. The people have time and again voted on it, and always with an increas-

ing majority, and now the Hon. Neil Dow tells us there is no such thing as a repeal party in the State. This fact speaks volumes.

It is not generally known that prohibitory enactments similar to the one we are now seeking have for years been enforced in parts of England, Scotland and Ireland, and with the greatest success. Let the following, which I copy from the pamphlet just referred to, testify :

PROVINCE OF CANTERBURY, ENGLAND.

In February, 1869, a Committee of the Lower House of Convocation of the Province of Canterbury reported 1,475 parishes where Prohibition prevails, and say that

"Few, it may be believed, are cognizant of the fact—which has been elicited by the present enquiry—that there are at this time, within the Province of Canterbury, upwards of one thousand parishes in which there is neither public-house nor beer-shop, and where, in consequence of the absence of these inducements to crime and pauperism, according to the evidence now before the committee, the intelligence, morality, and comfort of the people are such as the friends of temperance would have anticipated."

A writer in the *Edinburgh Review* for January, 1873, says :

"We have seen a list of eighty-nine estates in England and Scotland where the drink-traffic has been altogether suppressed, with the very happiest social results. The late Lord Palmerston suppressed the beer-shops in Romsey as the leases fell in. We know an estate which stretches for miles along the romantic shore of Loch Fyne where no whiskey is allowed to be sold. The peasants and fishermen are flourishing. They all have their money in the bank, and they obtain higher wages than their neighbours when they go to sea."

SALTAIRE, YORKSHIRE, ENGLAND.

Prohibition has prevailed for many years, and not a beer-shop or beer-house exists. The *Daily Telegraph* says :

"In short, the stage of experiment has been long passed ; the scheme has survived open hostility, envy, and detraction, and is now a brilliant success."

BESSBROOK, IRELAND.

Bessbrook, a town in Ireland of 4,000 inhabitants, has no liquor shop, and whiskey and strong drink are strictly prohibited. There is no poor-house, pawn-shop, or police station. The town is entirely free from strife, discord, or disturbance.

TYRONE COUNTY, IRELAND.

This county contains 61 square miles and 10,000 people. No public-house is allowed. The Right Hon. Lord Claude Hamilton, late M. P., said in 1870 :

" At present there is not a single policeman in that district. The poor rates are half what they were before, and the magistrates testify to the great absence of crime."

A year or two before his death, Father Mathew, in a letter to Mr. Delavan, said :

" The principle of prohibition seems to me to be the only safe and certain remedy for the evils of intemperance. This opinion has been strengthened and confirmed by the hard labour of more than twenty years in the temperance cause."

But what of the DUNKIN BILL in those parts of Canada where it has been tried ? Has it not been a failure ? I say, No, emphatically No. Here are our witnesses :

Mr. T. W. Casey, License Commissioner for Lennox and Addington, says : " In the Township of Richmond, County of Lennox, the by-law was adopted in 1865, and has ever since been in operation. At that time there were thirteen persons selling liquor in the township ; now there is not one. * * * * Though three votes have since been taken, it has been well sustained by the people ; and at the last vote, some two years ago, the vote was much larger in its favour than ever before. The Reeve of the township informs me that the falling off in the amount to be paid for paupers has been large. In fact, all the revenue once derived from licenses has more than been saved in the pauper fund alone. The County Judge was in my office yesterday, and he assures me, from his observation, that he considers the by-law in Richmond a perfect success, and he recommends every municipality to adopt it."

Mr. G. A. Purvis says : " For information to you concerning the Dunkin Bill in this township (Yonge), I must say it is a success. * * * We find the township revenue better supplied with the same taxation, with our old tipplers' increase of property, and less crime and idleness, and, of course, less paid out to keep the same in subjection. * * * You need not fear its success—it is the most perfect law we have. I tell you this, knowing and feeling its success for the last ten years."

Rev. J. W. McCallum, of Picton, says : " I am glad to have an opportunity of saying that I believe the Bill, in its working here, is anything but a failure. * * * Never were greater efforts made to defeat a righteous law, or make it appear ridiculous, than are being made to defeat the Dunkin Bill. Still, it is doing good and will succeed. * * *

Rev. J. Ash, of Ameliasburg, Prince Edward County, writes to me to the following effect :—

"In response to your enquiries respecting the practical effect of Prohibition in the County of Prince Edward, I hereby record it as my deliberate conviction, founded on close personal observation, that the interests of religion, public morality, and social order, have been greatly promoted by the adoption by the County of the Dunkin Act. We do not claim certainly that the law has been a complete success, but we do claim that the wilful violations of the law are not more marked or frequent than those of theft, Sabbath desecration, and incendiarism; and with equal consistence on this ground of failure, might the law be repealed against these, as the law for prohibiting the liquor traffic."

Rev. J. MacMechan writes: "I believe its effects have been decidedly advantageous all over the County, but mainly outside of Picton. As a friend of total abstinence, I esteem it a great help to the cause to have the Dunkin Law on the Statute Book. The Liquor Traffic is odious in all its aspects—morally, socially, religiously; but there is no stigma that damns it more effectually than its unlawfulness."

Mrs. Youmans says: "It had been said the Dunkin Act was a failure in Prince Edward; but how could that be when they voted on it three times and carried it each time? Everything had been done in the way of little legal quibbling to prevent the Act going into operation, but yet it did go into operation, and that with success. One of the results was that at the next Assize Court there was neither a criminal nor a civil case to be tried. The grocery and clothing stores also did a much larger business; and one baker said he had to bake an extra batch of bread to meet the increased demand. The business of the milkman also increased greatly. What was formerly spent on drink was now spent on the necessaries of life. I do not wish it to be understood that there is no whiskey sold in Prince Edward now, but the man who does so breaks the law, and is placed in the same dock with the thief and the burglar. They have no longer the law on their side."

A gentleman writes: "The Temperance party in this County have surmounted difficulty after difficulty, and to day are the proud possessors of the fact that this much-abused Dunkin Act has suppressed at least three-fourths of the drinking in the County. There is not a locality in which the good results of the temperance reform cannot be seen."

The Picton *New Nation*, referring to the alleged failure of the Dunkin Bill in Prince Edward County, says: "It is a palpable falsehood, made to bolster up a bad cause. To state that the traffic goes on about as it did before the Act came into force, is stating what every man, woman and child in Picton knows to be false. It is because the traffic is curtailed to a minimum and driven to secrecy and darkness that the Licensed Victuallers are so displeased with the law, and endeavour to cast ridicule upon it."

That, by improved legislation obtained since 1864, when the original Act was passed, the Dunkin Act can now be worked, is proved by the experience of Brighton Township, in our own County of Northumberland. There the Dunkin Act is in force, and that the people are pleased with it is shown by the fact that its representatives vote steadily for it every time in the Counties' Council, and one councillor who voted against it in 1875 was defeated in consequence when he sought re-election, and has never sat in the Council since.

Other similar testimony could be added if necessary, and yet, in face of all this and more, our opponents tell us the law is a failure. We thank God for the "failure," and hope we may see many such.

8. "*You can't make people moral by Act of Parliament.*" If this objection has any weight, it might be urged against any law on the Statute Book. We can't make people honest or truthful by Act of Parliament, yet that is considered no reason why we should not have a law against theft and perjury.

9. "*The Dunkin Bill does not prohibit the sale of liquor in quantities of five gallons and upwards. It would therefore increase drinking, as persons would bring it home with them and drink it there.*" To this I reply, that we have the most trustworthy assurance that, during the first session of Parliament, the Bill will be so amended as to be absolutely prohibitive. Our Dominion Parliament has already declared in favour of the principle of Prohibition by a vote of 72 to 9, and as soon as the question of jurisdiction is settled the "five gallon clause," as well as some other defects in the Bill, will be amended. So that by the time the Act will come into force in these Counties it will almost certainly be Total Prohibition. But though this were not the case, would it therefore be of no use? Some, I doubt not, are so far enslaved by the appetite for strong drink that they would bring it home in large quantities; but thousands now tiddle in bar-rooms and form the ruinous habit who would never dream of buying five gallons and bringing it home with them. Is it of no use to save our young men from acquiring the habit of drinking? Every year, as we have seen, 4,000 of them pass over from the ranks of moderate drinkers to the great army of

drunkards. But were it not for the bar-room with its "treating" and sociality they never would have formed the ruinous habit at all. Oh, Christian fathers, Christian mothers, whose eyes scan these pages, your own dear boys are in danger. With bar-rooms and boon companions on every side of them, is there no danger that they may fall like so many others? Give us then a helping hand to save those you love so much.

10. "*This Act, if passed, will deprive the travelling public of accommodation.*" Why so? Is whiskey so essential to good meals, good bedding, and comfortable rooms that these cannot exist without it? I can see no more reason for a good hotel being a groggery than for a dry goods store being such. Whatever little inconvenience hotel-keepers may subject the travelling public to for a short time, one may rest assured that in a little while the demand will create a supply. No better accommodation is to be had in the country than in those places where Prohibition is enforced. Mrs. Youmans says concerning Prince Edward Co.:—"On the 10th May all the hotels were locked up, and no omnibus was sent to meet the boats bringing the judge and others from Toronto. But the temperance people were equal to the occasion; they provided the judge and others with accommodation. And how long did this movement on the part of the hotel-keepers last? *Just thirty-six hours.*"

Mr. W. H. Gibbs, M.P. for North Ontario, in an address delivered in Brampton a few months ago, gave an account of his experience in travelling in Nova Scotia, in November, 1875, a distance of 90 miles, along the cold sea-coast of that Province, passing through several towns as large as Brampton, and stopping at first-class hotels in which no liquor had been openly sold for thirty-one years.

Mr. J. C. Snell, an extensive cattle importer in the County of Peel, writes as follows:—

"I recall a very pleasant drive of seventy-five miles through the State of Kentucky, two years ago this November, when the weather was quite as cold as we usually have it in this month. I had occasion to call at four wayside hotels in that distance. In none of these were there any liquors sold, and I remember these houses with pleasure, as clean, quiet, restful places, where first-class meals were served on snow-white table linen, the whole establishment savoring of 'sweet home.' Such testimony, I hope, will help to persuade our friends that a hotel is not necessarily a groggery; that, on the contrary, a groggery should be no part of a hotel. The fear that, in case the Dunkin Act is adopted, country people will find no accommodation for their horses, is, I feel persuaded, groundless."

11. "*But does not Scripture sanction the drinking of wine?*" We need not here enter into the question whether the Scriptures ever speak approvingly of any kind of wine that would intoxicate.

Many good men and excellent scholars, such as Professor Moses Stuart, the well-known commentator Albert Barnes, Professor Owen, President Nott, Dr. Lees, and many others, maintain that they do not, but that, on the contrary, "no precept and no example can be brought from the Scriptures to show that the habitual use, in any way of liquors, properly called intoxicating, is allowed." But without passing judgment on this, the earnest Christian who sincerely desires to know the mind of God on the Liquor Traffic cannot surely have much difficulty in so doing.

"Wine is a mocker, strong drink is raging; and whosoever is deceived thereby is not wise."—*Prov.* xx. 1.

"Be not deceived; neither fornicators, idolators, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards shall inherit the kingdom of God."—*1 Cor.* vi. 9, 10.

"Woe unto him that giveth his neighbour drink, that putteth thy bottle to him and maketh him drunken also."—*Hab.* ii. 15.

"It is good neither to eat flesh nor to drink wine, nor anything whereby thy brother stumbleth, or is offended, or is made weak."—*Rom.* xiv. 21.

"Be not ye, therefore, partakers with them. Have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them."—*Eph.* v. 7, 11.

Christian, you who are guided solely by the authority of God's word, can you read these passages and many other similar ones, and yet hesitate as to the teaching of Scripture on this matter? Review the facts I have feebly brought before you. See the effects of the traffic on the individual, on the family, on the church, on society. Listen to our judges, our gaolers, our police magistrates, testifying with united voice that it is the cause of three-fourths of all the pauperism, misery and crime of our land. Hear our medical men testifying to its ruinous effects on the body; hear the ministers of religion, of every denomination, bewailing the havoc of souls caused by drink, and declaring that no other form of sin so opposes and hinders the work of Christ, and can you doubt what the Lord would have you to do? The Liquor Traffic is evil, only evil, and that continually. It naturally leads to the violation of every command in the decalogue. The Apostle puts drunkenness along with the other legitimate offspring of this traffic, and here is the whole family: Adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings, murders, *drunkenness*, revellings, and such like." Here is an inspired title to place over every bar-room door in the land. And who with the facts I have brought before him, and which every man's own observation will abundantly confirm, will yet maintain that the mind of God is not sufficiently clear to him as to the path of duty on the present occasion? O, surely nothing could more strikingly show the perverse ingenuity of man than the

efforts that are now being made by the tavern keepers, brewers and distillers to twist and distort God's word so as to make it appear to sanction their nefarious work. The Christian is one who lives, not Cain-like, for self, but Christ-like, for others. He will not destroy the souls for whom Christ died, either directly by his example in countenancing the evil, or indirectly by his indifference in refusing to make an effort to abolish the evil. He will live

"For the cause that needs assistance—
For the wrongs that need resistance—
For the good that he can do."

In conclusion, let me guard against being misunderstood. Does any one ask, "Do you think that the passing of this Act would stop all drinking?" I reply, I do not think the mere *passing* of this, or any other law, will of itself do any good. To do good, a law must rise from and rest upon the earnest conviction of the people; and I believe that where the people, or a large majority of them, are in earnest on the matter, determined not only to pass but to *enforce* the law, then this law can be enforced as well as any other. I believe that, under such circumstances, the legislation we are seeking would diminish drinking to a considerable extent. "It would banish drink into dark corners; it would surround drinking with the atmosphere that surrounds all crime; if men would drink, it would be with doors locked, shame on their faces, and fear in their hearts." Respectable men would respect the law. Such we have seen has been the effect elsewhere, and such, I believe, would be the effect here. The law properly enforced will be protection to our young men from the snares of the treating system; protection to the drunkard, who would, but who cannot, resist the insatiable thirst when temptation besets him on every side; protection to the drunkard's heart-broken wife and neglected children; protection to the tavern-keeper himself from the guilt and shame of trafficking in the bodies and souls of his fellow-men; protection to his children from the taunt of being fed on the fruits of a disreputable business; protection to individuals, to homes, to society, to religion. But besides all this, the passing of this Act will show our Government and Parliament that we are in real earnest in asking for general prohibition. Our Premier, who is favorable to the temperance cause, says: "Show us, by using the laws you have, that you are in earnest, and we will give you more stringent legislation." We wish to take him at his word. And if we go on carrying the Dunkin Act in county after county with the success that has attended it during the past year, it will impress upon our legislators, in a manner not to be mistaken, what an overwhelming sentiment in favour of general prohibition there is in the country. And the result will be that before long we will get a law much better than the one we are now seeking. But the way to obtain a better, is to

use what we have. Fellow-Christians, contemplate the magnitude of the evil against which we are contending, and arise in the strength of God, and dare and do the right. As patriots, do your duty to your country ; as citizens, do your duty to society ; as parents, do your duty to your children ; and as Christians, be faithful, O be faithful to the Church of God. By all that is great, glorious and good, we call on you to come to the rescue of a crushed and groaning humanity. The tears of the widow appeal to you ; the sorrows of broken-hearted wives appeal to you ; the wail of starving children appeals to you ; the youth of our land, who may yet fall victims if the evil is allowed to go on, appeal to you. From Heaven there is a voice calling upon you to come to the help of the Lord against the mighty. Yea, hell unites with earth and heaven ; and from the hundreds of thousands of victims who through this traffic have entered an eternity of woe, there comes a piercing shriek calling on us to do what we can "lest others also come into the same place of torment." And shall heaven, earth and hell appeal to you in vain ? Depend upon it, if we are to secure victory we must work for it. Our opponents are thoroughly organized : every bar-room is a committee-room, every concession line will be canvassed, and everything that money, whiskey and a flood of Licensed Victuallers' literature can do will be done to defeat the right. The friends of humanity and of God must therefore devote themselves with constant, unwearied application to the work before them, resolved to combat by all honourable means the weapons of sin and Satan. But not only must we *work heartily*, but we must *pray earnestly*. O ! let there be a close clinging to the power of God. Let the Spirit be invoked in all His awakening and strengthening power. Let the glory of God be our great end, and love to God and man our chief motive in this contest, and then, whatever be the immediate result, we know that in the end Truth will and must prevail.

" Still our onward course pursuing,
God speed the right ;
Every foe at length subduing,
God speed the right !
Truth, thy cause, whate'er delay it,
There's no power on earth can stay it,
God speed the right !"